

And the predictable result of this irrational policy: We send the Secretary of Energy with hat in hand begging OPEC to raise production. The Sheiks in the Middle East must be laughing all the way to the bank as they contemplate how this administration has turned America into a dependent of OPEC.

They must view with mild amusement the irrational pie-in-the-sky policies that this administration has tried to sell to the American people. Would this administration support building more nuclear facilities to reduce our dependence on OPEC? NO!

Would they support building new non-polluting hydro-electric facilities to reduce our dependence on OPEC? No. In fact, in what must be one of the most naive proposals from this Administration, they have been proposing tearing down dams that have been providing power for decades. Tearing down dams at a time when we are 56 percent dependent on imported oil is simply unconscionable. How would we replace this lost source of power? Does the administration support building more coal fired power plants? No. So how do President Clinton and Vice President GORE propose that we generate energy to run our industry and fuel our transportation system? Year in and year out what we hear from this administration is one word: Renewables—solar, wind, and geothermal.

I know the Administration is always emphasizing renewable energy as the best option. They are all important, but they constitute less than 4 percent of U.S. energy production and for the foreseeable future are not going to make a dent in our energy production.

I hope someday renewables will play a bigger role. We have to face reality. In 25 years, if there are technological breakthroughs, they may play a more important role, but today they have almost no role.

Face it: Today there are no solar airplanes; there are no economically feasible solar automobiles; there are no wind-powered, solar-powered trains. It gets dark in Alaska in the winter. None of these concepts is on the drawing board. The fact that the administration does not want to face up to this is evident up to now and in the foreseeable future.

This administration hopes they can get out of town before the crisis hits, the calamity of the American public asking: What have you done? You sold our energy security to the Saudis and some of the other Third World nations.

For 8 years, this administration has been blind to the facts and lived in a renewable dream world. Today, the American consumer is paying the price for the failed energy policies of the Clinton-Gore administration.

Today's gas prices may wake us up and call the country to the recognition that we have to begin to address, with long-term solutions, our energy security issues. If we don't do that, we may look back on March 2000 as the good

old days when gasoline was only \$1.70 a gallon. As we propose taking off this 4.3 percent, I look forward to the administration's response as to how the Vice President broke that tie. He and the administration are responsible for the tax costing the American consumer \$43 billion.

PARDON ATTORNEY REFORM AND INTEGRITY ACT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Senator HATCH, Senator NICKLES, and I, along with other Senators, introduced S. 2042, the Pardon Attorney Reform and Integrity Act. The Judiciary Committee has now reported this legislation to the floor. I wanted to say just a few words about why I believe this legislation is needed and why I hope the Senate will act quickly.

Last September, President Clinton decided to grant clemency to 11 members of the Puerto Rican terrorist groups FALN and Los Macheteros. When this decision became known, it was greeted with virtually universal shock and disbelief, followed by calls for the President to reconsider and ultimately by near universal condemnation. The FALN had been involved in numerous terrorist acts. The most heinous of these acts was the bombing of Fraunces Tavern in New York City. In the middle of the lunch time rush at this Wall Street tavern, FALN members planted a bomb. The explosion killed four people and left 55 people wounded. In addition, FALN has taken credit for more than 130 bombings, attempted bombings, bomb threats and kidnappings. They took credit for the bombing of office buildings in New York and Chicago where at least one other person was killed and several more injured.

Although it has been suggested that the individuals the President pardoned were not convicted of direct involvement in these acts, the conduct that they were convicted of made clear that they all played important roles in facilitating the activities of the organization, fully aware that the entity in question engaged in just this kind of conduct. Despite this, there is no evidence that any of them are seriously remorseful about their serious wrongdoing. Singling them out for the extraordinary favor of Presidential clemency is, under these circumstances, frankly inexplicable.

Both this body and the House of Representatives passed resolutions stating our disapproval of the President's action. Following these events, the Committee on the Judiciary held two hearings on how the President had made his decision. In the first of these hearings, it was discovered that Reverend Ikuta, a supporter of clemency for the terrorists, had several meetings with the Department of Justice concerning the potential grant of clemency. At the same time, law enforcement officials, who attempted to contact the President and

the Department of Justice concerning the clemency, received no response from the administration. Nor were the victims consulted in any way. The son of one of the victims of the Fraunces Tavern bombing was told in 1998 by the FBI that they were still searching for the FALN member thought to have planted the bomb. Meanwhile, the President was considering granting clemency to individuals who not only were members of the group responsible for the bomb in the first place, but also who may have had information about the whereabouts of this primary suspect. The victims of the terrorists' acts were never even informed of the President's grant of clemency. They had to read it in the newspaper. Perhaps the gravest oversight of all is that the terrorists were never asked to provide any information about other FALN members who are still on the FBI most wanted list.

The goal of this bill is to try to do what Congress can to prevent this situation from recurring. The bill would require the Department of Justice, if asked to investigate a pardon request, to make all reasonable efforts to inform the victims that a pardon request is being reviewed and give the victims an opportunity to present their views. The Department is also required to notify the victims of a decision to grant clemency as soon as practical after it is made and, if it will result in the release of someone, before release of that person if practicable. The bill also requires that the Department of Justice make all reasonable efforts to determine the views of law enforcement on whether the person has accepted responsibility for his or her actions and whether the person is a danger to any person or society. Finally the Department must determine from federal, state and local law enforcement whether the person may have information relevant to any ongoing investigation, prosecution, or effort to apprehend a fugitive, and to determine the effect of a grant of clemency on the threat of terrorism or future criminal activity.

Opponents of this bill argue that it is an unconstitutional infringement on the Presidential pardon power. This is not so. This bill dictates a process to be used when the President delegates investigatory power to the Department of Justice. Accordingly, this bill is not a usurpation of the President's pardon power, but within the legitimate exercise of Congress's power, in establishing the Department of Justice, to "make all laws which are necessary and proper for carrying into Execution" not only the powers vested in Congress but also "all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof." The President's own freedom to exercise the pardon power however he sees fit is in no way infringed by this bill. In fact, this bill only acts to ensure that the President has the information before

him to make a well rounded and informed decision. The President can ignore the information provided by the victims and the law enforcement officers if he chooses to do so. I would hope that he would not. But while requirements that would force him to give particular weight to their views would most likely be unconstitutional, requiring the Department to make this information available to him, for whatever use he chooses to make of it, surely is not. Indeed, the President and the Department of Justice should be supportive of this bill as it should help return to the American people confidence in the clemency process that may have been lost following the release of the FALN and Los Macheteros terrorists.

It is unconscionable that in this instance, the views of the victims and law enforcement officers, the parties most affected by both the criminal act and the clemency, were ignored in the decision making process. This bill goes a long way in helping to prevent a recurrence of the defects in process in President Clinton's grant of clemency last September to the 11 terrorists. It will enhance the quality of information available so as to ensure a more balanced basis for the President's decisions regarding clemency. I am, therefore, pleased the committee has reported this legislation to the floor of the Senate, and I urge its prompt enactment.

ACTS OF BRUTALITY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, for the second time in one week, I come to the floor of the Senate to bring attention to an atrocious and despicable act of brutality against innocent men, women, and children.

Just 8 days ago, the Government of Sudan bombed nine towns, hospitals and feeding centers in the areas of the vast country outside of their control. As I said a week ago, they did not hit key rebel facilities or strongholds. However, they did bomb the town of Lui and the only rudimentary hospital and a TB clinic for a hundred mile radius.

They killed, maimed, and injured dozens of innocent and infirmed civilians.

As I said last week, I know this "target" well. It is the very hospital where I served as a volunteer surgeon and medical missionary just two years ago.

One of the worst aspects of the bombings is that the Government of Sudan knew exactly what these targets were. There was no mistaking it. Rebel forces had even caught government army agents attempting to mine the airstrip earlier in the year.

Last Sunday, 4 days after the bombing, the old Soviet cargo planes, which have been converted into bombers, returned. They dropped no bombs, but inspected the damage of the earlier raid and, we suspect, continued selecting targets.

On Tuesday morning, just past 10 a.m. local time, the bomber returned.

It dropped 15 more bombs on the Samaritan's Purse hospital it targeted last week.

The sad part of the story is that it is not surprising. For years the Government of Sudan has targeted the relief facilities of organizations it deems friendly toward the rebels. That is, those who operate exclusively in areas outside of government control or those who criticize the regime in Khartoum.

In the town of Yei, the hospital has been bombed so many times, bombings of the facility no longer necessary even makes it to wire reports.

On February 8 of this year, one of those routine bombings of civilian targets was especially horrific, when school children in the Nuba Mountains region—an isolated area especially devastated by government bombings and offensive—were killed as they took their lessons under a tree. At least a dozen students and two adults were killed by antipersonnel bombs pushed out the cargo doors of the converted cargo planes. These were school-children. They were not rebels nor child soldiers, but children learning to read.

In that case, we have good reason to believe that the strike was retribution for the local Roman Catholic Bishop, who has been charged with treason for coming to the United States in an effort to publicize the atrocities of his government against its own people. It was a school run by his church and a location that he was known to frequent.

In general, the United States policy is pointed in the right direction with respect to Sudan: its primary focus is on ending the war through multilateral negotiations, and on aiding the areas of greatest food insecurity.

But the United States policy is not without serious flaws, the greatest of which is failing to use our full diplomatic and economic weight to change the political environment where the Government of Sudan can repeatedly and intentionally bomb civilian targets, including schools and hospitals, and not face a single substantial objection from any member of the United Nations Security Council—nor any member of the United Nations.

That includes the United States. We do not sufficiently use the international body to promote peace to even raise objections about the murder of innocent civilians.

This failure of the international community to forcefully act or to raise even routine objections in international fora in an effort to stop the most brutal and devastating war since the Second World War is as inexplicable as it is tragic.

It is also hypocritical when compared to any number of United Nations sponsored peace missions.

Why is the United Nations so unwilling or unable to act? Because it lacks the necessary leadership among its members. It lacks the type public exposure to the truth of the horrors in

Sudan to cause sufficient shame and embarrassment to change inaction into action.

The United Nations and its members do not suffer from a lack of information about the war I have described as lurking on the edge of the world's conscience. The United Nations own Special Rapporteur for Sudan has submitted an extensive report detailing the atrocities and some common sense recommendations for the body to act upon. But nothing has happened.

It is behind this veil of obscurity that some of our closest allies' inaction has somehow instead become the United States "isolation" on the issue. It is behind this veil of obscurity and sense of this being an esoteric American issue that inaction has hidden and thrived.

That failure, that veil of obscurity, is the greatest tragedy of them all. The United Nations was formed to stop or prevent injustice such as what is happening in Sudan. But it has instead become a vehicle for obfuscation of responsibility. It has become the chosen forum for denial and the Sudanese government's charm offensive: a concerted and effective public relations effort which portrays them as simply "misunderstood" and the victim of undeserved American vilification.

The United Nations should be the forum to pull the war in Sudan from the edge of the world's consciousness, to the center of the world's attention. To fail to take every reasonable opportunity to use the United Nations to generate the necessary embarrassment and shame to drive our complicity and compel nations to act to end the war would be the greatest failure of our policy and a tragic loss of potential for good. It is our failure to fully use the United Nations as an effective instrument to end the war in Sudan which must become a major focus of the United States policy.

If the United Nations is not used as a forum for resolution of a conflict like this, and if we are not willing to assert American leadership within that forum, the unavoidable question becomes what, then, is the purpose of United Nations and our membership therein?

CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, nearly two decades ago, President Carter submitted to the Senate the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, known in shorthand as the "Womens' Convention."

In the two decades since then, the Committee on Foreign Relations has acted on the Convention only once. In 1994, the Committee voted to report the treaty by a strong majority of 13 to 5. Unfortunately, the 103rd Congress ended before the full Senate could act on the Convention.